



## GOVERNOR'S COORDINATING OFFICES

COMMUNITY INITIATIVES • SERVICE & VOLUNTEERISM • PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT  
CRIME CONTROL & PREVENTION • SMALL, MINORITY & WOMEN BUSINESS AFFAIRS  
CHILDREN • DEAF & HARD OF HEARING

### *Governor's Office for Children*

Larry Hogan, Governor

Boyd R. Rutherford, Lt. Governor

Jaclin Warner Wiggins, Deputy Director

To: Local Management Board Chairs and Points of Contact

From: Kim Malat, Assistant Deputy Director, Governor's Office for Children

Date: February 21, 2019

Re: FY20 Notice of Funding Availability Question and Answer Recap #4

- .....
1. **For the evidence of effectiveness section of the Program/Strategy/Planning page, if we are considering funding a program/strategy that has been in existence for three or more years but has only 2.5 years of Scorecard data (based on when Children's Cabinet funding was first awarded), does this qualify as a new/early program or an existing program?**
    - a. **If it's a new/early program, do we need to include the 2.5 years of Scorecard data or just research that supports this as an appropriate intervention? The NOFA doesn't address this.**
    - b. **If this qualifies as an existing program, we can provide data on the past 2.5 years of performance, but do we have to also include research?**

This can be handled in two ways:

- 1) If the Board has performance data from the period before the program/strategy was funded with Children's Cabinet funds, the Board may include both the Scorecard data and the pre-Scorecard data to satisfy the requirement of 3 or more years' data for an existing program. The performance measures must be the same for the separate funding streams to allow reviewers to see the trend.
- 2) If the Board elects to use only the 2.5 years of Scorecard data for this program/strategy, a combination of evidence of effectiveness and program data can be provided. See the notes document from the pre-application meeting, Section I, number 11.

2. **For the existing program, can you clarify what's needed for the "data discussion"?**

In keeping with the Results Based Accountability framework, the data discussion is general notes about the data, e.g. why data is missing and when it will be available, identification of the assessment tool used, changes in the data source, clarification of the data source, explanations about the changes in the method of calculation, etc. This may be the same data discussion that's been entered in the Scorecard if the required Scorecard data entry is current and complete.

**3. Aside from the target number to be served by each program/strategy, do we have to establish targets for the FY20 proposed performance measures?**

Identifying the number proposed to be served for the identified target population in the program/strategy/planning page is meant to support the Board's assertion that the program is a critical need in the community. This is not the same as identifying targets for each of the performance measures, which has not been required for several years.

**4. After reviewing the priority performance measures for evidence-based home visiting listed in the NOFA Appendix F, we are interested in using the depression screening measure. However, to align with the evidence-based Healthy Families America model, we are proposing some changes to the numerator and denominator. Per the model, participants who enroll prenatally should receive a prenatal depression screening and a depression screening within three months of the birth of the child. For participants who enroll post-natally, they should receive a depression screening within three months of the birth of the child. Are these changes possible without compromising the opportunity for the extra point for proposing an evidence-based home visiting model?**

Yes, this is possible. We have consulted with the Department of Health's Maternal and Child Health Bureau, and have been advised that the MIECHV benchmarks have been updated and align with the measure you are proposing. In order to be eligible for the extra point, the performance measure should align with those approved by MIECHV. The revised benchmarks document has been posted to the Google Drive here:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/18\\_q7jdk8cewa37Ntv-iHbyF2UHHvM-4/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/18_q7jdk8cewa37Ntv-iHbyF2UHHvM-4/view?usp=sharing)

**5. Could you please clarify from Recap #2, question 16, the requirement for a separate program/strategy page if a vendor is performing a differently-designed program? In FY19, we had one program that has two vendors, with two separate budgets, but only one application was submitted. Each vendor has a distinct role but also share clients and caseloads. Should we submit a program/strategy page for each vendor for FY20?**

A separate form is only required if the different vendors are operating programs whose design is different from each other. For example, if the information provided in the program/strategy/planning page is the same for each vendor, site, etc., a separate page is not necessary (although a separate budget will still be required when the Community Partnership Agreement contract is prepared).

**6. A request for proposals is currently out to bid for a program that will serve disconnected youth. Potential vendors have posed the following questions:**

- a. What qualifies as not working for disconnected youth?
- b. Does any amount of work disqualify youth?
- c. If a youth is working for cash or in-kind services, is this considered disconnected?
- d. Can disconnected be defined as "neither working" nor "not receiving a W-2 or Form 1099"?
- e. Is any documentation required to certify the status of not working?

Not working = not working. So, any amount of work, any number of hours, even underemployed - regardless of employment status with respect to Form 1099 or W-2 means that a youth is not considered disconnected.

Working under the table, for cash or for barter disqualifies a person from being considered disconnected. We cannot say if it disqualifies that person from services - because we do not know the guidelines and design for the programs and the services to which that person may be eligible. Also, the answer may be different for Children's Cabinet-funded programs for FY19 and FY20, because in FY19, the Board must fund interventions for those who are disconnected and in FY20, there is the option of including prevention along with intervention. There is no documentation of work status that is required by the Children's Cabinet.

- 7. On the program/strategy/planning page, the last section titled “Proposed Performance Measures (not required for a planning request)”, I am working on completing the chart. I am unsure if in the right hand column where the numerator and denominator are requested, if targets for FY20 should be included for the proposed performance measures or if I should include the FY19 actual data for the measures?**

Neither targets for the proposed measures nor actual data for FY19 is meant to be included in the right column. The chart provided is one that has been made available to the Boards for a few years to use in creating new performance measures. It is incorporated in the template this year to assist the Board in developing new measures (to ensure that you are able to obtain data for those proposed measures). If the Board is not proposing new measures for FY20, the information from this chart may be cut and pasted from other work papers. For further assistance, please review Clear Impact’s tutorials on how to create calculated measures or the Clear Impact Scorecard 101 webinar recording that's linked on the Scorecard’s homepage at the bottom of the Administrator Message on the right side.

- 8. Can a program/strategy address prevention and intervention concurrently? For example, a program that serves Opportunity Youth can include prevention of disengagement and re-engagement (where appropriate).**  
Yes, this is possible.